

Murray History Advisory Board
Minutes for October 28, 2008

Attendance: Kathy Romero, Karen Greenwell, Newel Standley, Richard Hansen, Lee Brinton,
Mary Ann Kirk (staff), Kirk Huffacker (Utah Heritage Foundation)

Excused: Sherm Davies

1. Minutes for September 23, 2008 were approved. Board members agreed that the current meeting schedule on the 4th Tuesday of every month at 4:30 pm will continue for 2009 with no meeting scheduled in December unless necessary. A few corrections were made to the board roster.
2. Board Elections: Newel Standley, Chair
Karen Greenwell, Vice-Chair
3. The new smelter video segment was shown. This DVD will be given out at the plaza dedication and then will be sold for \$10. Richard Hansen will represent the board and give a short address at the ceremony on October 29 at 2:30 pm.
4. The city has hired a company from Portland to complete a downtown master plan. The initial concepts include a historic section from State to Poplar and new construction west of Poplar that is very similar to our DHOD ordinance and guidelines for this area. It features underground parking, pedestrian friendly environment, and explores ways to link the hospital to the area. This plan is in its very early stages and currently covers from State to Box Elder and Vine to 4800 South.
5. Kirk Huffacker discussed conservation districts and how they differ from historic districts. Historic districts may have demolition restrictions and process for design review. A conservation district is a tool for preservation but often less restrictive than a historic district although it can include any kind of restriction such as demolition or design review. He shared an article that stated "neighborhood conservation districts are areas located in residential neighborhoods with a distinct physical character" although they may not merit a designation as a historic district. Kirk suggested that a conservation district could have design guidelines as an educational tool without a formal design review process. It usually takes some kind of enabling legislation through ordinance that describes the process to create a conservation district and has grassroots involvement. The neighborhood is involved in the process and the property owners help define what kinds of requirements they want to impose on themselves. Each district overlay may feature different zoning requirements than the underlying zone based on the input from the neighborhood such as maximum height and setback. A conservation district is administered through zoning and the city planning department. Kirk shared examples of three different overlays in Salt Lake City that have different requirements for each and were tailored for each neighborhood. The neighborhood did their own research and worked with the zoning department to create their own requirements. It really helped identify the boundaries of these neighborhoods. Mary Ann asked if a conservation

district could apply to a historic district. Kirk said it can. But if a National Register neighborhood is not protected, it can be at risk over time when buildings are demolished. Lee thought this may throw up a red flag to those who want to buy a home in the neighborhood. Mary Ann noted it may, but also can work in reverse. People may purchase a home because it is in a historic district and they like the character and don't want it changed. An established district can protect what they value in their neighborhood.

Mary Ann noted that a city task force did explore the issue with monster homes and she thinks they adjusted the city ordinance to address height and setback. This committee also discussed the problem with appeals and how exceptions were often made.

Newel wondered if you can eliminate the appeal process for certain requirements. Lee said the group for appeals is Board of Adjustments and you can get an adjustment for almost anything you want. The City Council is responsible to appoint the members.

Lee and Kathy asked how many neighborhoods might benefit from this. Mary Ann described a number of areas from the 1930s, 40s, and 50s era. There are many that have distinctive neighborhood characteristics. It does not necessarily have to have historic preservation as its main goal. Richard noted one of the handouts used the word "community character" rather than historic qualities. Lee didn't see any problem with an additional tool or mechanism available to neighborhoods. He isn't looking for a lot of work to do extra research. Mary Ann wasn't sure if it would create extra work for planning and zoning. Kirk thought if it is straight forward for each district, it would be fairly simple for the building department. It usually involves things like height, setback, garage placement - not design. Kirk shared a publication they produced to educate owners about how to tastefully make changes or new compatible infill that are considerate of neighbors. Mary Ann wondered if planning and zoning could have a handout for applicants. Lee noted that some homes have been updated that are consistent without adversely affecting the neighborhood.

Mary Ann asked board members if they wanted to move forward with this discussion. Board members thought the idea might be useful for the city. Mary Ann will discuss this with Tim Tingey. Kirk Huffacker will look for possible wording for ordinance language. G.L may be able to help find wording. We could then forward a recommendation to the Mayor's office and City Council.

6. Mary Ann reviewed the goals and projects and what has been completed over the past two years. She invited board members to help wherever they are interested. Mary Ann will revise this and we can set new goals in January.
7. Wording for the registry policy was reviewed. Mary Ann clarified that National Registry Districts do include b sites so this needs to be clarified in the policy. We also need to recognize that our designations may differ from the state because we are more aware of history background which is not typically known in a RLS survey process. We also need

to define “historical significance” as we review b sites for inclusion on the register. Newel suggested we include wording in the policy that clarifies the designations are according to Murray’s designations and may differ from the state. We need to formally approve this policy. Kathy asked if homeowners apply for designation. Mary Ann said a few do but the board usually nominates homes for the register. The only buildings on our register are from before 1920s. We will start to add homes in later eras based on RLS surveys and specific styles we are looking for. We will also review our current A and B buildings. Newel has taken current photos to help us in this process. Karen was willing to help Mary Ann go through the current list to make some board recommendations. We will need to do research for future nominations either with our board or paying a stipend for a professional to complete an ILS survey.

8. Kathy suggested we take a few field trips so new board members learn about the historic sites. Kathy asked how we can protect some of our significant buildings. Mary Ann noted that we have restrictions in the DHOD but not elsewhere. We wanted to have some kind of demolition restrictions in our ordinance but city officials were nervous about this. We may reconsider this at a future date. Kathy was concerned about the Murray 2nd Ward. Mary Ann said we try to be proactive but sometimes potential new owners are not willing to save a building. This happened with Bonnyview. Unfortunately a potential buyer walked because the owner demolished the building. A group of artists are interested in the Ore Sampling Mill. The Nelson and Sons building has some great potential for adaptive reuse.